

**Farragut State Park
Natural Resource Plan
Citizens Advisory Committee
Open House March 11, 2003**

These are central points of oral public commentary received:

- Maybe plan should be more fire prevention than logging plan.
- What is original reason for this plan? Why?
- What is the fundamental issue?
- Is “fire” a smokescreen?
- Lakeshore is the wrong place to do a ponderosa pine restoration.
- An independent audit and review of the Resource Plan should be done.
- Farragut is a healthy mixed forest with a natural transition.
- Ponderosa pine will increase fire risk –setting a fuse for future problems.
- A mixed dense forest burns slower.
- Fire could be stopped before it reaches Bayview with the resources in the park, Bayview, Athol, and Spirit Lake.
- Has the IDFG role of wildlife management been replaced by use patterns in the park?
- Is joint management a good practice – should be one agency or another.
- Where is the long-range plan for the park – for example weed management?
- A tremendous amount of land in the park is not productive or useful because of weeds.
- Don’t take the lowest bid – take the best logger for the best practices.

- Oversight of any timber project is critical.
- The teeth in law is questioned if there is adequate regulation for enforcement.
- What are the limits of recreation in the park – where do campgrounds and day use areas stop?
- Where is the multiuse plan that addresses growth within the park?
- This is an “alleged” restoration of ponderosa pine.
- (we) are getting endless rhetoric that eventually sounds like it makes sense.
- The previous IDFG cutting by stumpage measurements showed more dollars could have been collected.
- This is human recreation at the expense of the wildlife.
- Where is the park going?
- How much human occupancy/use? Where is the limit?
- The park on the North side already has existing use conflicts: hiker, biker, and horseback rider.
- A repetition of the North side mistake is inexcusable.
- (I support) ...very very selective use of chain saws in timber management.
- What is stand density on the North side? I estimate 3000 per acre.
- North side (for fire risk) is a higher priority.
- The land as it is now is so changed, there is not accurate role of fire in the park.
- The North side is a higher fire danger.
- (I am) against the cut just for \$\$\$.
- The beauty of the pride equates to pride for Idaho.
- There are other reasonable alternatives.
- (I have) concerns for the older growth trees.

- The park is beautiful the way it is.
- Forest practices (management) seem to change with the discipline of the University of Idaho.
- (I dated) a logger who cut and could cut any tree in the park for a load of firewood to the supervisor of the project.
- A fire loving forest near a threatened community is a bad idea.
- Look at Heyburn...there are trunk burns 30-40 feet up and killed areas of ponderosa pines from burns. Insect mortality is increased from fire-damaged ponderosa pine.
- No rational exists for ponderosa pine management.
- Small burns equal continuous burns with degrading air quality.
- A high use recreation area, therefore wildlife needs cover. No place for wildlife in this prescription. Look at the disk golf area for a mix of recreation and cover.
- This is devastating to wildlife that needs cover.
- There is too much rain for ponderosa pine.
- A functioning ponderosa pine habitat takes 2000 acres.
- Previous logging was taking of old growth.
- Previous logging promised not to impact trails but did.
- The use of trails to logging roads is not right.
- Ponderosa pine management is a bad idea for forest health, air quality, etc.
- Habitat for new bird species is not accepted as needed and it will take years for new species to find the area.
- Jurisdiction is irrelevant in this instance – IDFG in particular.
- The selection process of the CAC resulted in the exclusion of some people with insight and expertise: example Mike Lee and Jere Mosier.
- I have not visited Heyburn in two years as a result of the logging. I would be impressed if it had ½ recovered.

- Erosion and the resultant spread of noxious weeds into the lake are expected if too much undergrowth goes.
- There is beauty and tranquility that would be destroyed by logging.
- This is the only lakeshore there is in the park...to retain.
- The existing lake/forest transition zone is important for psychological terms.
- The lakeshore trail is important.
- The park is not for timberland and logging.
- There is no reason to trust this procedure.
- There needs to be more advanced notice and publicity for open houses.
- Some logging which has been done in this area verges on criminal...for example some private logging areas.
- On your field trips (CAC) take someone that understands the logging process.
- Bark beetles are always present and stress increases the trees vulnerability. Also basal areas and compaction of soils is increasing stress too.
- Trees are the issue to protect-buildings and facilities are secondary in event of fire.
- Thanks for the time on the CAC
- This could be a showcase project.
- What is scientific logging? (Referred to Leopold by Susan)
- There is a question of similarity of the ponderosa pine forest – for example Payette/McCall vs. North Idaho. We can't compare these areas.
- The thinning for a better forest in other areas took the best trees.
- Use Scouts (volunteers) in management practices.
- Heyburn is a slash job for profit not forest betterment.
- If it burns, it is ok...that is a natural cycle.
- This is the wrong area to cut, wrong area for ponderosa restoration.

- Shoreline preservation is critical.
- There need to be more public meetings.
- Do ponderosa pine restoration and direct at the old parade grounds.
- The slope of the area says it is the wrong area to cut.
- Survey more users of the park on this project.
- Reforest the knapweed areas and eradicate other noxious weeds.
- Other logging areas have not been done as described (heavy handed cutting)
- There is a need to no pad camping sites and mix of facilities in the park.
- If you want to see the lake – walk—don't cut the trees.
- Park needs active management of land versus passive.
- Look at the private lands that suffer without thinning (logging)
- State needs to work with passive managers in the area (demonstration plot)
- There is active management needed in some cases.
- Fire risk is significant – but the year it burns is unknown.
- The bark beetle risk is more insidious for old ponderosa pine in a dense stand.
- Do we manage how the forest changes or let it change itself?
- McCall/Payette areas are a good example of open areas with reduced understory.
- There needs to be a long range comprehensive plan for the park, not the one shot plan like weed spraying a few years back.
- There need to be open and accessible accounting records of the sale. \$ go to restoration, donation, etc.
- The net dollars stay in the park unless stated upfront.
- (I question) the likelihood of a devastating fire occurring.
- Even a mixed forest burns.

- I question if this area is become wetter in some areas and ponderosa pine restoration is even conceivable then.
- What is a chain in forest measurement? (Mark Weadick responded)
- The park is at significant fire risk during the driest part of the year with the highest visitation.
- There should be defendable zones for fire protection created within the park.
- Ponderosa pine needles are more flammable so therefore how can fire safety be a tangent of restoration?
- Ponderosa pine while not fire loving burns more often. The understory is a critical component of a devastating fire.
- What is the comparison of the speed of fire in comparison of duff of the ponderosa to grass?
- (I believe) ...grass fires burn faster.